

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

Nos. 07-3652, 08-1252/2094

---

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Larry Thomas, Husband; Rosie Lee  
Thomas, Wife,

Appellants.

\*

\*

\*

\* Appeals from the United States

\* District Court for the

\* Eastern District of Arkansas.

\*

\* [UNPUBLISHED]

\*

\*

---

Submitted: May 7, 2009

Filed: May 22, 2009

---

Before RILEY, SMITH, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Larry and Rosie Lee Thomas appeal from the district court's<sup>1</sup> adverse grant of summary judgment as well as its denials of their post-judgment motions to quash a writ of assistance and for other relief. On appeal, they argue that the district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction. Upon de novo review, *see Myers v. Richland County*, 429 F.3d 740, 745 (8th Cir. 2005), we conclude that the court had jurisdiction

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable G. Thomas Eisele, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

under 28 U.S.C. § 1345.<sup>2</sup> Finally, we find no basis for reversing the district court's denials of appellants' post-judgment motions. *Cf. Lara v. Sec'y of Interior*, 820 F.2d 1535, 1542-43 (9th Cir. 1987) (district court may issue orders pending appeal to enforce judgment).

Accordingly, we affirm in each of these three consolidated appeals. *See* 8th Cir. R. 47B. Appellants' pending motion for contempt is denied.

---

---

<sup>2</sup>In particular, we find no merit to appellants' jurisdictional argument that is apparently based on *Pigford v. Glickman*, 185 F.R.D. 82 (D.D.C. 1999), *aff'd*, 206 F.3d 1212 (D.C. Cir. 2000).